



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.               | CONFIRMATION NO.            |
|---|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 09/809,004  | 03/16/2001  | Robert S. Marshall   | 279252US8                         | 5117                        |
| 22850 7590 01/09/2008<br>OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.<br>1940 DUKE STREET<br>ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314 |             |                      |                                   |                             |
|   |             |                      | EXAMINER<br>SALTARELLI, DOMINIC D |                             |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT<br>2623                  | PAPER NUMBER                |
|   |             |                      | NOTIFICATION DATE<br>01/09/2008   | DELIVERY MODE<br>ELECTRONIC |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding:**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

|                              |  |  |  |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>09/809,004     | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>MARSHALL ET AL. |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>Dominic D. Saltarelli | <b>Art Unit</b><br>2623                |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 November 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on July 18, 2007 has been entered.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2, 9-12, and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zereski, Jr. et al. (5,654,886, of record) [Zereski] in view of Throckmorton et al. (5,818,441) [Throckmorton].

Regarding claim 15, Zereski teaches a method for merchandising information to a broadcast customer, said method comprising:

storing the merchandising information in a database (col. 6, lines 10-16);

receiving changed information (col. 3, lines 48-64);

automatically updating the stored information based on the received changed information (col. 5 line 55 – col. 6 line 16);

defining a video layout based on a selection made by the broadcast customer, the video layout including a subset of the stored information and a screen layout of the stored information (col. 5, lines 34 – 54 and col. 6, lines 36-67);

formatting a broadcast-ready data stream including the subset of stored information formatted according to the desired screen layout (col. 7, lines 13-34);  
and

transmitting the broadcast-ready data stream from an Internet server to the broadcast customer (col. 7 line 54 – col. 8 line 13).

Zereski fails to disclose receiving the broadcast-ready data stream from the server and combining the received broadcast ready data stream with video content broadcast by the broadcast customer.

In an analogous art, Throckmorton discloses a system wherein a broadcast customer (col. 3, lines 35-67) receives broadcast ready data streams from a providing server (the associated data received through associated data generation unit 16, shown in fig. 2) and combines the broadcast ready data stream with video content broadcast by the broadcast customer (col. 5, lines 19-64), providing the benefit of enabling a broadcast customer to enhance their own

broadcast video product with additional content retrieved from a server which supplements the original video product (col. 7, lines 13-30).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Zereski to include receiving the broadcast-ready data stream from the server and combining the received broadcast ready data stream with video content broadcast by the broadcast customer, as taught by Throckmorton, for the benefit of enabling a broadcast customer to enhance their own broadcast video product with additional content retrieved from a server which supplements the original video product, such as financial data or weather information (Throckmorton, col. 5, lines 33-37).

Regarding claim 2, Zereski and Throckmorton disclose the method of claim 15, wherein said defining is performed at a single location that is remote from a location of the broadcast customer (customers access the finished product remotely over the Internet, Zereski, col. 7, lines 54-60).

Regarding claim 9, Zereski and Throckmorton disclose the method of claim 15, wherein said transmitting further comprises transmitting the broadcast-ready data stream to the customer upon a command of the broadcast customer (Zereski, col. 7 line 54 – col. 8 line 13).

Regarding claim 10, Zereski and Throckmorton disclose the method of claim 15, wherein said defining further comprises integrating the desired subset of stored information with advertising material (Zereski, fig. 8, advertisement 146).

Regarding claim 11, Zereski and Throckmorton disclose the method of claim 15, wherein each broadcast-ready data stream is different from another broadcast-ready data stream (there are different presentations for different geographical regions, Zereski, col. 7 line 54 – col. 8 line 13).

Regarding claim 12, Zereski and Throckmorton disclose the method of claim 15, wherein said information includes proprietary information (Zereski, col. 3, lines 18-64).

Regarding claims 14, Zereski and Throckmorton disclose the method of claim 15, wherein formatting further comprises formatting the stored information to produce a real time broadcast-ready data stream (Zereski, col. 5, lines 4-23).

Regarding claim 16-18, Zereski and Throckmorton disclose the method of claim 15, wherein Zereski discloses the selection made by the broadcast customer is accomplished using an interactive dialog stored on the server (a user, through a graphical user interface, specifies presentation specifications,

col. 6, lines 17-23 and col. 8, lines 43-52, this includes defining first and second screen positions of content in the video layout for the stored information, in order to creates the presentations shown in figs. 5-10).

5. Claims 3-8 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zereski and Throckmorton as applied to claims 2 and 15 above, and further in view of Murphy (6,564,380, of record).

Regarding claim 3, Zereski and Throckmorton disclose the method of claim 2, but fail to disclose said defining further comprises integrating the desired subset of stored information with images associated with the broadcast customer.

In an analogous art, Murphy discloses a method for merchandising information to a broadcast customer (col. 6 line 15 – col. 7 line 45 and col. 10 line 38 – col. 11 line 4 and col. 17, lines 9-40) wherein images associated with the broadcast customer are integrated in to the merchandising information (col. 18, lines 15-25), creating markings on the content that marks it as unique to the broadcast customer.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Zereski and Throckmorton to include images associated with the broadcast customer are integrated in to the merchandising information, as taught by Murphy, for the benefit of creating

markings on the content that marks it as unique to the broadcast customer, preventing possible theft of the content.

Regarding claim 4, Zereski and Throckmorton disclose the method of claim 15, wherein said merchandising information comprises weather information (Zereski, col. 3, lines 15-47), but fails to disclose said merchandised information comprises sports information.

In an analogous art, Murphy discloses a method for merchandising information to a broadcast customer (col. 6 line 15 – col. 7 line 45 and col. 10 line 38 – col. 11 line 4 and col. 17, lines 9-40) wherein sports information is included (col. 18, lines 5-14).

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Zereski and Throckmorton to include sports information, as taught by Murphy, for the benefit of expanded offerings of information to customers.

Regarding claim 5, Zereski, Throckmorton, and Murphy disclose the method of claim 4, but fail to disclose said merchandising information includes scores and schedules of contests a marketing area of the broadcast customer.

However, Murphy does teach the information provided is very specific, localized, and commercial in nature, including high-interest events that are used

to promote a business (col. 18 line 55 – col. 19 line 7) in addition to more traditional information such as sport related information (col. 18, lines 5-9).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Zereski, Throckmorton, and Murphy to include scores (such as sports scores of local teams, as suggested by Murphy in including sports information) and schedules of contests within the customer's marketing area (which fall under the category of high interest events used to promote a business disclosed by Murphy), for the benefit of increasing the selection of information to be made available to users which would interest them.

Regarding claim 6, Zereski, Throckmorton, and Murphy disclose the method of claim 4, wherein said merchandising information includes weather data from sites within a marketing area of the broadcast customer (Zereski, col. 7 line 54 – col. 8 line 13).

Regarding claim 7, Zereski, Throckmorton, and Murphy disclose the method of claim 4, but fail to disclose said defining further comprises associating weather and sports information in the desired subset of stored information with a game-time forecast of weather conditions at a specific game location.

However Murphy does teach providing localized information (col. 6 line 64 – col. 7 line 16 and col. 16, lines 64-67), and weather and sports information (col.

18, lines 5-9), in addition to performing advanced editing on a video stream according to the requests of a customer (the PoP combines sets of image data to create composite image data as a finished product video feed, col. 18, lines 15-25).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Zereski, Throckmorton, and Murphy to include in said defining integration of weather and sports information (localized weather and sports information combined into a video stream) to provide a game-time forecast of weather conditions at a specific game location (wherein including the time and location of a sporting event along with the local weather in a single video stream provides this forecast).

Regarding claim 8, Zereski and Throckmorton disclose the method of claim 15, wherein said defining is performed at a location that is remote from a location of the broadcast customer (customers access the finished product remotely over the Internet, Zereski, col. 7, lines 54-60), and includes selecting a desired screen layout of the stored information to be included in the broadcast-ready data stream (Zereski, col. 6, lines 17-23 and col. 8, lines 43-52), but fails to disclose said selecting is by done by the broadcast customer.

In an analogous art, Murphy discloses a method for merchandising information to a broadcast customer (col. 6 line 15 – col. 7 line 45 and col. 10 line 38 – col. 11 line 4 and col. 17, lines 9-40) wherein broadcast customers are

provided with an interface for accessing merchandising information (col. 11, lines 5-26 and col. 12, lines 24-63), providing the benefit of assisting customers in ordering desired content.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Zereski and Throckmorton to include an interface provided to broadcast customers for selecting content, as taught by Murphy, for the benefit of assisting customers in ordering desired content (wherein the modification is simply to provide remote access by broadcast customers to the database manager taught by Zereski in col. 6, lines 17-23).

Regarding claim 13, Zereski and Throckmorton disclose the method of claim 15, but fails to disclose access to the broadcast ready data stream is limited to only the broadcast customer by use of a password.

In an analogous art, Murphy discloses a method for merchandising information to a broadcast customer (col. 6 line 15 – col. 7 line 45 and col. 10 line 38 – col. 11 line 4 and col. 17, lines 9-40) wherein access to a broadcast ready data stream is limited to only the broadcast customer by use of a password (col. 11, lines 27-38), for the benefit of restricting any unauthorized access.

It would have been obvious at the time to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method disclosed by Zereski and Throckmorton to include access to the broadcast ready data stream is limited to only the broadcast

customer by use of a password, as taught by Murphy, for the benefit of restricting any unauthorized access and securing the transaction.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dominic D. Saltarelli whose telephone number is (571) 272-7302. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00am - 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DS

